FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

Second Appeal No. 226/2000
(*Aniket Suresh Borwankar* **VERSUS** *Jagdeo Rajaram Ingole & 2 others***)**

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's orders of directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders

CORAM : Smt. Vasanti A. Naik, J.
DATE : 9th July, 2007.

Though one of the respondents had expired during the pendency of the appeal, no steps are taken by the appellant to bring the legal heirs of deceased respondent on record.

This Court had granted time to the appellant on a number of occasions to take necessary steps. On 20.06.2007, the counsel for the appellant had submitted that the appellant has refused to accept the registered letter issued by the counsel for the appellant to the appellant. It was further pointed out to this Court that the appellant had not responded in spite of several communications issued to the appellant. The counsel for the appellant had sought two weeks' time to file a pursis and to file the copies of the communication issued by the counsel to the appellant. However, nothing has been done in that regard. It appears from the statements made

on behalf of the counsel for the appellant that the appellant is not interested in prosecuting the matter.

None appears on behalf of the appellant today. The second appeal is, therefore, dismissed for want of prosecution.

JUDGE

APTE

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

Second Appeal No. 228/2000
(*Aniket Suresh Borwankar* **VERSUS** *Jagdeo Rajaram Ingole & another***)**

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's orders of directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders

CORAM : Smt. Vasanti A. Naik, J.
DATE : 9th July, 2007.

Though one of the respondents had expired during the pendency of the appeal, no steps are taken by the appellant to bring the legal heirs of deceased respondent on record.

This Court had granted time to the appellant on a number of occasions to take necessary steps. On 20.06.2007, the counsel for the appellant had submitted that the appellant has refused to accept the registered letter issued by the counsel for the appellant to the appellant. It was further pointed out to this Court that the appellant had not responded in spite of several communications issued to the appellant. The counsel for the appellant had sought two weeks' time to file a pursis and to file the copies of the communication issued by the counsel to the appellant. However, nothing has been done in that regard. It appears from the statements made

on behalf of the counsel for the appellant that the appellant is not interested in prosecuting the matter.

None appears on behalf of the appellant today. The second appeal is, therefore, dismissed for want of prosecution.

JUDGE

APTE